

that no one should possess more than an equitable share. That is to say, wealth should be distributed without reference to the differences of character and strength that exist between the impulses of different individuals. One man requires much, another little, to make him happy. To one ambition is more than art, to another both these are less than change : one finds change in travel, another in games, a third in a novel. Under a socialistic regime these varieties of taste could not be considered in fixing the share of each individual. Passions would be eliminated as contributory industrial forces, and industry would need to be its own reward. The community undoubtedly includes a large number of individuals in whom the industrial impulse is so strongly developed as to urge them to work irrespective of personal advantage. But, judging from the facts of common experience, the greater proportion will not work unless this impulse is reinforced by selfish considerations, and there are not a few who will not work except under the stress of necessity or compulsion. A hive of bees displays unselfish industry, but they are moved by directive instinct, whereas the behaviour of man is the product of a multiplicity of impulses. Can we believe that his relations with other men might be arranged so as to rest upon one of them only ? In exceptional cases such a fabric can be built up : the monastic system is based upon the

ascetic  
impulse : the Indians of Paraguav  
were disciplined in the minutest details of life by  
their reverence for their Jesuit masters. But  
the construction is essentially unstable. and  
cannot endure  
unless human nature is, so to speak,  
emasculated.  
Our hopes for the future must fall short  
of Utopia.  
and we must be content with the less  
heroic  
prospects of lessening evil and  
increasing good.